United Nations S/2001/410

Security Council

Distr.: General
26 April 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 24 April 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you that 164 unexploded cluster bombs, missiles, other ordnance and anti-personnel and anti-tank mines left behind by the 1991 30-nation aggression against Iraq were found and rendered harmless in all parts of Iraq in the period from 1 February to 31 March 2001. The detonation of one such bomb killed eight children in the Faw area.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammed A. **Al-Douri**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-35142 (E) 270401 270401

United Nations S/2001/411

Security Council

Distr.: General
26 April 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 24 April 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 23 April 2001 from Mr. Tariq Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister and Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. The letter concerns the constant aggression to which Iraq is being subjected by numerous parties, the most recent case being the Iranian aggression of 18 April 2001, and the negative attitude adopted by the Security Council with regard to its commitment to safeguarding the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Iraq.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mohammed **Al-Douri**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

01-35154 (E) 300401 300401

Annex to the letter dated 24 April 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

After the events of 2 August 1990, the Security Council imposed on Iraq the series of coercive measures that it inaugurated by its resolution 661 (1990) of 6 August 1990 imposing a comprehensive embargo on all military and civilian trade between Iraq and other countries.

This resolution was followed by others that strengthened the comprehensive embargo, and these resolutions and the measures taken for their implementation deprived Iraq, inter alia, of the right to import weapons for its self-defence.

There then came the 30-nation aggression against Iraq that began on the night of 16/17 January 1991 under the guise of implementing Security Council resolution 678 (1990), and the entire territory of Iraq became a target for aggression in which weapons of all types were used against all the country's vital amenities. One hundred and twenty thousand tons of bombs were dropped on Iraq, or the equivalent of eight to ten atomic bombs of the type used at Hiroshima. This aggression caused the destruction of Iraq's vital infrastructure and, of course, the aggression also targeted sites maintained by the Iraqi army and its defensive equipment and weapons.

Not content with the comprehensive embargo and the 30-nation aggression, the United States proceeded, after the departure of Iraqi forces from Kuwait, to have the Security Council adopt its resolution 687 (1991), which was used as a screen for the destruction of many of Iraq's scientific and military installations on the pretext of destroying weapons of mass destruction. By paragraphs 24 to 27 of the resolution, the Council tightened and set forth in detail the terms of the arms embargo that had been imposed on Iraq. These measures were further strengthened by resolution 700 (1991), pursuant to which the arms embargo would extend even to uniforms and tents for the use of troops.

In order to distance itself from the charge of having stripped an independent State of the means necessary for its legitimate self-defence, the Security Council incorporated into its resolutions, commencing with resolution 686 (1991), a paragraph in which it affirmed the commitment of all Member States to the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Iraq.

In paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991), the Council notes that the actions to be taken by Iraq with respect to weapons of mass destruction and missiles "represent steps towards the goal of establishing in the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction and all missiles for their delivery". In the statement by the President of the Security Council of 28 June 1991 (S/22746), it is stated that:

> "The members of the Council reiterate their views expressed in resolution 687 (1991) of the threat that all weapons of mass destruction pose to peace and security in the Middle East and of the need to work towards the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of such weapons."

Events since 1991 have conclusively demonstrated that the Security Council has not met its commitments with respect to the protection of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of Iraq or with respect to the implementation of paragraph 14 of resolution 687 (1991).

Immediately following the failure of the 30-nation aggression to break the will of the Iraqis and impair their national unity, the United States and the United Kingdom proceeded to incite acts of armed rebellion against the Government of Iraq and to supply armed terrorist groups with money and weapons in order to undermine the country's stability and jeopardize its national unity. At the same time, they proceeded, by their own unilateral decision, to impose the two no-flight zones; first in northern Iraq, on 7 April 1991, and then in southern Iraq, on 27 August 1992. Later, on 3 September 1996, they extended the no-flight zone in southern Iraq from the 32nd parallel to the 33rd parallel. It has been clear from the outset that there has been no authorization from the Security Council for the imposition of the no-flight zones. The imposition of these zones and the use of force in them therefore represents a breach of the principle of non-use of force under the Charter of the United Nations and a violation of the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Iraq. Since the no-flight zones were imposed, more than 50,000 violations have been committed by United States and British aircraft, and they have included the bombing and destruction of military and civilian sites as well as the killing of 340 people and the wounding of more than 1,000.

The United States and British acts of aggression against Iraq in the no-flight zones have also been accompanied by military aggression in which missiles and aircraft are used on occasions chosen by the United States for purposes relating to its policy.

On 8 March 1991 United States forces attacked the third air defence sector with cruise missiles.

On 17 January 1993 United States forces attacked Al-Nida' Establishment, a civilian installation at that time subject to the ongoing monitoring regime, causing large-scale physical damage and human losses. The Rashid Hotel in Baghdad was also targeted, and a woman hotel employee was killed and many staff and guests were injured.

On 27 June 1993 United States forces attacked the headquarters of the intelligence services in Baghdad with cruise missiles, and some of the missiles fell on neighbouring homes and killed a number of civilians, including the Iraqi artist Layla al-Attar.

On 3 and 4 September 1996 United States forces again engaged in military aggression, using cruise missiles against military and civilian sites in various parts of Iraq, including Baghdad.

From 16 to 19 December 1998 the United States and the United Kingdom conducted an intensive missile attack on military and civilian sites in all parts of Iraq, and the United States and the United Kingdom resumed their aggression with the intensive bombing of civilian localities in the outskirts of Baghdad on the evening of 16 February 2001.

The United States and the United Kingdom are still pursuing their ongoing military aggression against Iraq with the support of the governments of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey, which are providing facilities and support for the United States and British aircraft in their daily aggression against Iraq. The United States is still proclaiming its contempt for the resolutions of the Security Council calling for respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iraq. It is still announcing its intention to change the political regime in Iraq, and it has enacted a

domestic law for that purpose, namely the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998. Faced with all of this, the Security Council has nevertheless taken no action to give effect to its call to States to respect Iraq's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence.

The Turkish armed forces, for their part, are also continuing their aggression against Iraq's territory. Turkish ground and air forces conduct periodic and systematic incursions into Iraqi territory in the north during which they bomb towns and villages, kill civilians and destroy property. There were thus 76 incursions into northern Iraq by the Turkish armed forces between 1991 and 2001, and the strength of the forces participating in these incursions has varied between 51,000 and 110,000 troops a year, supported by armoured personnel carriers and tanks as well as by fighter aircraft and helicopters. It is derisive for Turkey to justify its repeated incursions into Iraqi territory in the north by invoking the need to pursue outlaws who take refuge in northern Iraq when Turkey itself participated in creating the anomalous situation that obtains in northern Iraq through its cooperation with the United States and the United Kingdom in creating what they have called a "safe haven" for the Kurds. Iraq keeps the Secretary-General and the President of the Security Council informed on a regular basis of the particulars of the constant Turkish acts of aggression against its territory in the north, and it did so most recently in a letter dated 8 January 2001 from its Minister for Foreign Affairs addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council (S/2001/31, annex). The Security Council has, however, taken no action to safeguard Iraq's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence.

Iran's aggression against Iraq has been ongoing since 1991. Following the 30-nation aggression, Iran sent large numbers of infiltrators into Iraq's southern governorates in order to foment disorder, cause destruction and impair the unity of Iraq's territory. Iran has maintained its constant aggression against Iraq and continues to shelter, finance and arm terrorist groups serving its schemes to undermine Iraq's stability.

Acts of aggression committed by Iran against Iraq include: an air raid on the towns of Jalula' and Khalis on 25 May 1993; a mortar attack on Khalis on 28 November 1993; a mortar attack on the Abu Ghurayb depots on 2 April 1994; a mortar attack on Khalis on 18 October 1994; an attack on Khalis using three Scud missiles on 6 November 1994; an air raid on Khalis on 9 November 1994; the detonation of a car bomb in Baghdad on 26 November 1995; an air raid on Kut and Jalula' on 29 September 1997; a mortar attack on Amarah on 26 May 1999; an air raid on Jalula' on 14 March 2000; a helicopter attack on the central sector on 24 January 2000; a mortar attack on the Ali al-Gharbi area on 2 September 2000; a heavy artillery bombardment of Iraqi border positions in the Diyala area on 10 February 2001; and the firing of 10 120-mm shells at Iraqi positions in the central sector on 10 February 2001.

The most recent large-scale act of aggression took place between 0400 and 0700 hours on 18 April 2001 when the Iranian armed forces fired 64 Scud surface-to-surface missiles at Iraqi towns and villages in the Basrah, Maysan, Wasit and Diyala governorates, killing many citizens, leaving some dozens of wounded and causing destruction and serious damage in many civilian neighbourhoods and to civilian installations.

These events and incidents confirm that the Security Council has not fulfilled its undertakings with respect to Iraq's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity or the establishment in the Middle East of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery. On the contrary, the Council's other actions in arbitrarily destroying Iraq's power and infrastructure and preventing Iraq from building up its defensive abilities at a time when the region is experiencing a frenzied arms race have all encouraged regional and non-regional parties to persist in committing armed aggression against Iraq.

This anomalous situation and the use of double standards and selectivity in the way the Security Council conducts itself raise a legitimate question, namely: where is this Security Council policy leading us? It has damaged the United Nations, has jeopardized regional peace and security and has established precedents for the Council's silence with regard to acts of aggression and the violation of the Charter of the United Nations. The primary victim of this policy is Iraq, which is being subjected to daily and constant aggression while arbitrary measures are being maintained against it that deny it the full exercise of its legitimate right of self-defence under Article 51 of the Charter. Does this mean that the Security Council has renounced its commitment to ensure respect for Iraq's sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence? We ask you, and we ask the Security Council, for a clear and unequivocal answer. Does this then mean that Iraq has the right to use the same means with regard to outlaws that use the countries bordering on Iraq as bases from which to engage in acts of sabotage inside Iraq?

We hope that our inquiry will receive the attention that befits the seriousness of its subject matter. As we await your response to our legitimate concerns, we affirm that the steadfast people of Iraq, using the means available and acting at the right time and in the appropriate circumstances, will continue to resist acts of aggression in defence of its territory and security as well as of the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

(Signed) Tariq **Aziz**
Deputy Prime Minister
Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs

United Nations S/2001/412

Security Council

Distr.: General
26 April 2001
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 25 April 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to call your attention to an item entitled "The ongoing story of Kuwaiti mendacity" that was broadcast by the Iraqi satellite television channel on the evening of 23 April 2001 (see annex). The channel claimed that in the report you submitted to the Security Council in late March on the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission (UNIKOM) (S/2001/287), you revealed that Kuwait had engaged in "a high level of activity ... at the oil installations on the Kuwaiti side of the demilitarized zone, ... near Abdali", and it represented this as documented proof that Kuwait had been stealing Iraqi oil. In view of the serious nature of these allegations, I should like to state the facts set forth hereunder.

1. The item on the so-called "ongoing story of mendacity" broadcast by the Iraqi satellite television channel is an obvious and deliberate distortion of the facts. Paragraph 10 of your semi-annual report on UNIKOM reads as follows:

> "A high level of activity was observed at the oil installations on the Kuwaiti side of the demilitarized zone, particularly near Abdali. Iraqi oil production in the same vicinity also expanded considerably during the reporting period."

This clearly shows that the Iraqi satellite television channel neglected to cite the second sentence in the paragraph and focused only on the mention of oil-related activity on the Kuwaiti side, producing this as evidence that Kuwait was stealing Iraqi oil and representing it to be a fact documented by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. The Iraqi assertions accusing Kuwait of draining off Iraqi oil reservoirs by way of Kuwait's northern oilfields are not new. Officials of the Iraqi regime have from time to time made it their custom to level such accusations in the context of their ongoing policy of contriving crises. This policy reflects the true state of affairs with respect to the intentions the regime has for Kuwait, which are other than peaceful and are, indeed, hostile, as is indicated, in particular, by the fact that the selfsame assertion or accusation was used by the Iraqi regime to justify its invasion of Kuwait in 1990.

3. For its part, Kuwait has refuted the Iraqi accusations that Kuwait is stealing oil, and it documented this refutation in its identical letters dated 18 September 2000 (S/2000/876). Kuwait has also declared its readiness to cooperate with any impartial

01-35148 (E) 300401 300401

body the Security Council may see fit to establish to investigate these Iraqi accusations, on the understanding that such a body should visit Kuwaiti and Iraqi oilfields on both sides of the border.

4. The high significance of the item broadcast by the Iraqi satellite television channel lies in the fact that it distorted the true nature of the statement made in the Secretary-General's report and exploited it in such a way as to serve the purposes of repeated Iraqi allegations and claims that have no basis in truth. The reference in your report to oil-related activity on the Kuwaiti side and on the Iraqi side was, after all, made in the context of a characterization of the situation in the demilitarized zone and without any indication that there had been any violation by either party. This would therefore confirm that such oil-related activity is a sovereign right of both Kuwait and Iraq in exploiting the wells located inside their respective territories in the border region.

5. While Kuwait is constantly giving expression, in word and deed, to its sympathy for the suffering of the Iraqi people, the Iraqi regime is most regrettably arousing the sentiments of Iraqi citizens against the Government and people of Kuwait in a manifest attempt to invert the facts, shirk its responsibility for the aggression it committed against Kuwait in 1990 and sow hatred and enmity among the peoples of the region. This is to be regarded as a most dangerous matter for the future of the region and for its security.

Accordingly, Kuwait denies these repeated Iraqi accusations in the strongest terms. It urges you, by virtue of your responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security, to deal vigorously and expeditiously with these fallacies, to intervene with the Iraqi Government in order to ask it to desist from maintaining such an attitude and from engaging in hostile practices that pose a serious threat to the security and stability of Kuwait, and to take whatever measures are necessary to refute in an unequivocal manner the transparent Iraqi attempts to falsify and distort the facts.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mansour Ayyad Sh. A. **Al-Otaibi**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

Annex to the letter dated 25 April 2001 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Item broadcast on the Iraqi satellite television channel on 23 April 2001

Follow-up to the news

The ongoing story of Kuwaiti mendacity

The rulers of Kuwait began their lives on the political stage with a lie, and they have continued in this mode of falsification, mendacity and deception so as to inflict harm on the Arab nation. As for the ongoing story of Kuwaiti mendacity and fabrication against Iraq, the instalments of that serial began at the time the national regime in Iraq first came into being. But it acquired a regular form in 1990 when the American public relations companies contrived the drama of Nayyirah and the incubators and that of the seagull.

The rulers of Kuwait have learnt nothing from the disclosure of their lies and have indeed continued them in a frenzied campaign to perpetuate the crime of the embargo and the crime of aggression.

Here is an update report on the continuing story of Kuwaiti mendacity

Since 1990 the ongoing story of the mendacity and falsification practised by the rulers of Kuwait has had no ending. Time has hardly effaced one of their wholesale fabrications before the vipers of the House of Sabah spew out a new lie in the long series that was begun by Nayyirah Al-Sabah with her lie about the incubators and the premature babies and that leads up to the denial by the mendacious rulers that they have been stealing Iraqi oil, despite the fact that this has been documented by Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations. The rulers of Kuwait have never learnt anything from the exposure of their lies and of the falsity of their allegations. Indeed the passing of the years and, with them, the growth of Arab and international support for Iraq's cause and for its just demand that the embargo be lifted have kindled in the souls of the House of Sabah clique a fire of enmity and rancour towards Iraq and has impelled them to commit many new stupidities that have prevented inter-Arab reconciliation.

Bush the Younger, who depends on those who launched the 1991 aggression, had no sooner announced his policy towards Iraq than the rulers of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia began a wide-ranging media, diplomatic and political campaign in order to perform the role assigned to them in the corridors and lobbies of the Black House and in order to implement the anti-Iraq policy of their American masters.

The frenzied Kuwaiti campaign against Iraq coincided with the American call for a strengthening of the embargo behind the facade of so-called smart sanctions, and it was reflected in the statements made by a number of the rulers of Kuwait seeking the retention of the embargo imposed on Iraq. In addition to their endeavour to prolong the embargo, the rulers of Kuwait are doing everything in their power so that the military aggression against Iraq by way of the United States military bases in Kuwait and Saudi Arabia can continue and are insisting that the so-called no-

flight zones imposed by unilateral decision of the United States and the United Kingdom outside the framework of the relevant United Nations resolutions should be maintained.

Accordingly, Sabah Al-Ahmad insolently declares that the no-flight zone in southern Iraq is essential to Kuwait's security. The statements of Sabah Al-Ahmad represent an explicit invitation to his American masters to continue the daily aggression being carried out by United States and British aircraft against Iraq, and they contribute to the scheme to justify the United States occupation of Kuwait. This is especially evident since Sabah Al-Ahmad said in the very same statement: "We will never say to the Americans and the British, 'Get out of Kuwait'".

This demonstrates the malicious motives that drive the rulers of Kuwait and their Saudi partners in their frenzied campaign against Iraq, which they are trying to conceal behind a facade of hypocrisy and falsification by means of attempts to portray themselves as not being opposed to the lifting of the embargo being maintained against Iraq.

The rulers of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, however, quickly betrayed themselves when they opposed the adoption by the regular session of the Arab Summit Conference held in Amman of a separate resolution calling for the lifting of the embargo against Iraq and when they evaded any commitment to the committee to monitor the situation between Iraq and Kuwait that the Arab Summit decided to establish under the chairmanship of King Abdullah II of Jordan.

It appears that, in reality, the rulers of Kuwait are in need of a pretext to justify the United States occupation of their country and that they find it in promoting the policy of their American masters with regard to so-called smart sanctions against Iraq. This was abundantly clear in the position they maintained, together with the rulers of Saudi Arabia, at the Amman Summit.

To further expose their misrepresentations and lies concerning the prolongation of the embargo against Iraq, Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in the report on the activities of the United Nations Iraq-Kuwait Observation Mission in the demilitarized zone that he submitted to the Security Council in late March, reveals that "A high level of activity was observed at the oil installations on the Kuwaiti side of the demilitarized zone, ... near Abdali".

The statement in Kofi Annan's report is interpreted by oil industry people to mean that the rulers of Kuwait are draining off Iraqi oil from the Iraqi reservoirs located over the boundary or, in plainer terms, that they are stealing Iraq's oil.

Iraqi experts estimate the value of the quantities of Iraqi oil that have been stolen by the rulers of Kuwait at 2 billion dollars. Does not Iraq therefore have a right to demand that the United Nations and the Security Council should halt this "high activity" theft?

These are some of the instalments there have been in the ongoing story of Kuwaiti mendacity that first began in 1991 and that has yet to end, despite the ever-expanding map of Arab and international support for Iraq.

United Nations S/2001/413

Security Council

Distr.: General
27 April 2001

English
Original: English and French

Draft resolution

The Security Council,

Reaffirming all its previous resolutions on Western Sahara, in particular resolutions 1108 (1997) of 22 May 1997, 1292 (2000) of 29 February 2000, 1301 (2000) of 31 May 2000, 1309 (2000) of 25 July 2000, 1324 (2000) of 30 October 2000, and 1342 (2001) of 27 February 2001, and also its resolution 1308 (2000) of 17 July 2000,

Recalling the relevant principles contained in the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel of 9 December 1994,

Welcoming the report of the Secretary-General of 24 April 2001 (S/2001/398) and the observations and recommendations contained therein, and *expressing* full support for the role and work of the Personal Envoy,

Reiterating full support for the continued efforts exerted by the United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO) to implement the Settlement Plan and agreements adopted by the parties to hold a free, fair and impartial referendum for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara,

Noting that fundamental differences between the parties over the interpretation of the main provisions of the Settlement Plan remain to be resolved,

1. *Decides* to extend the mandate of MINURSO until 30 June 2001, with the expectation that the parties, under the auspices of the Secretary-General's Personal Envoy, will continue to try to resolve the multiple problems relating to the implementation of the Settlement Plan and try to agree upon a mutually acceptable political solution to their dispute over Western Sahara;

2. *Requests* the Secretary-General to provide an assessment of the situation before the end of the present mandate;

3. *Decides* to remain seized of the matter.

01-35244 (E) 270401

United Nations S/2001/414

Security Council

Distr.: General
27 April 2001

Original: English

Draft resolution

The Security Council,

Recalling its resolutions 808 (1993) of 22 February 1993, 827 (1993) of 25 May 1993, 1166 (1998) of 13 May 1998 and 1329 (2000) of 30 November 2000,

Having decided to consider the nominations for ad litem judges of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia received by the Secretary-General,

Forwards the following nominations to the General Assembly in accordance with article 13 ter (1) (d) of the Statute of the International Tribunal:

Mr. Aydin Sefa **Akay** (Turkey)

Ms. Carmen Maria **Argibay** (Argentina)

Ms. Lucy **Asuagbor** (Cameroon)

Mr. Jeremy **Badgery-Parker** (Australia)

Mr. Chifumu Kingdom **Banda** (Zambia)

Mr. Roberto **Bellelli** (Italy)

Mr. Pierre G. **Boutet** (Canada)

Mr. Hans Henrik **Brydensholt** (Denmark)

Mr. Guibril **Camara** (Senegal)

Mr. Joaquin Martin **Canivell** (Spain)

Mr. Romeo T. **Capulong** (Philippines)

Mr. Oscar **Ceville** (Panama)

Mr. Isaac Chibulu Tantameni **Chali** (Zambia)

Mr. Arthur **Chaskalson** (South Africa)

Ms. Maureen Harding **Clark** (Ireland)

Ms. Fatoumata **Diarra** (Mali)

Mr. Cenk Alp **Durak** (Turkey)

Mr. Moise **Ebongue** (Cameroon)

Mr. Mathew **Epuli** (Cameroon)

01-35268 (E) 270401

Mr. Albin **Eser** (Germany)

Mr. Mohamed Al Habib Fassi **Fihri** (Morocco)

Mr. John Foster **Gallop** (Australia)

Mr. Joseph Nassif **Ghamroun** (Lebanon)

Mr. Michael **Grotz** (Germany)

Mr. Adbullah Mahamane **Haidara** (Mali)

Mr. Claude **Hanoteau** (France)

Mr. Hassan Bubacarr **Jallow** (Gambia)

Ms. Ivana **Janu** (Czech Republic)

Mr. Aykut **Kiliç** (Turkey)

Ms. Flavia **Lattanzi** (Italy)

Mr. Per-Johan **Lindholm** (Finland)

Mr. Augustin P. **Lobejón** (Spain)

Mr. Diadié Issa **Maiga** (Mali)

Ms. Irene Chirwa **Mambilima** (Zambia)

Mr. Dick F. **Marty** (Switzerland)

Ms. Jane Hamilton **Mathews** (Australia)

Ms. Suzanne Mengue **Zomo** (Cameroon)

Mr. Ghulam Mujaddid **Mirza** (Pakistan)

Mr. Ahmad Aref **Moallem** (Lebanon)

Mr. Mphanza Patrick **Mvunga** (Zambia)

Mr. Rafael **Nieto-Navia** (Colombia)

Mr. Léopold **Ntahompagaze** (Burundi)

Mr. André **Ntahomvukiye** (Burundi)

Mr. Cesar Pereira **Burgos** (Panama)

Mr. Mauro **Politi** (Italy)

Ms. Vonimbolana **Rasoazanany** (Madagascar)

Mr. Ralph **Riachy** (Lebanon)

Mr. Ingo **Risch** (Germany)

Mr. Robert **Roth** (Switzerland)

Mr. Zacharie **Rwamaza** (Burundi)

Mr. Sourahata Babouccar **Semega-Janneh** (Gambia)

Mr. Tom Farquhar **Shepherdson** (Australia)

Mr. Amarjeet **Singh** (Singapore)

Ms. Ayla **Songor** (Turkey)

Mr. Albertus Henricus Joannes **Swart** (Netherlands)

Mr. Gyorgy **Szénási** (Hungary)

Mr. Ahmad **Takkieddine** (Lebanon)

Ms. Chikako **Taya** (Japan)

Mr. Krister **Thelin** (Sweden)

Mr. Stefan **Trechsel** (Switzerland)

Ms. Christine Van Den **Wyngaert** (Belgium)

Mr. Volodymyr **Vassylenko** (Ukraine)

Mr. Lal Chand **Vohrah** (Malaysia)

Ms. Sharon A. **Williams** (Canada)

United Nations S/2001/415

Security Council

Distr.: General
26 April 2001
English
Original: French

Letter dated 23 April 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to bring to your attention the statement on the Montenegrin parliamentary elections of 22 April 2001 issued on 23 April 2001 by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Pierre **Schori**
Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations

01-35102 (E) 260401 260401

Annex to the letter dated 23 April 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: English and French]

Statement on the Montenegrin parliamentary elections of 22 April 2001 issued on 23 April 2001 by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union

The European Union welcomes the orderly conduct of the parliamentary elections in Montenegro. The electoral process has lived up to European standards. The European Union now looks forward to the formation of a government that will continue the path of democratic reform and lead a policy that respects the will of the citizens of Montenegro.

The European Union urges the new Montenegrin government to resume the dialogue with Belgrade without delay, aiming at an agreed redefinition of Federal relations, according to democratic principles and in a way that will ensure the stability of the region. The successful outcome of this dialogue, which excludes any unilateral action, would enable the European Union to continue its political, economic and financial support to Montenegro.

A senior officials Troika from the European Union will visit Podgorica and Belgrade on 24 and 25 April to reinforce this message.

The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union, the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, and the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area align themselves with this statement.